DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 923 CG 012 858

AUTHOR Kurtines, William M.
TITLE Situation or Person? Toward a Psychosocial Role-Theoretical Approach to Personality.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Southeastern Psychological Association (24th, Atlanta, Georgia, March 15-18, 1978); Best Copy Available
AVAILABLE FROM William M. Kurtines, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, 33199

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Environmental Influences; *Individual Characteristics; Individual Psychology; *Personality; Research Projects; Role Perception; *Role Theory; Self Actualization; Situational Tests; *Social Behavior; *Social Psychology; Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

This psychosocial role-theoretical approach to personality attempts to combine the conceptual utility of a role-theoretical perspective with the methodological utility of modern psychometric theory and multivariate research design. It focuses on the prediction of situation-specific interpersonal behavior. A conceptual model is presented, as well as measurement and research models for operationalizing it. Research studies are described which tested the empirical validity of the conceptual model and illustrated the application of the measurement and research models. Each study was concerned with the development and cross-validation of a set of measures for predicting situation-specific behavior. The different types of role-related behavior utilized were: (1) a traditional performance variable, academic achievement; (2) self-reported behavior; and (3) behavior observed in an experimentally controlled situation. Results supported the validity of the conceptual model. As predicted by the model, both person and situation variables were differentially and significantly related to the various indices of role performance. Results of the cross-validation of each study indicated that better prediction of situation-specific behavior can be obtained by combining both sources of information. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160923

SITUATION OR PERSON?

TOWARD A PSYCHOSOCIAL ROLE-THEORETICAL APPROACH TO PERSONALITY

WILLIAM M. KURTINES

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the 24th Annual Convention of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, Ga., 1978.

Requests for reprints should be sent to William M. Kurtines, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, 33199.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W M Kurtines

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG012858

Abstract

This paper describes a psychosocial role-theoretical approach to personality. The approach, which attempts to combine the conceptual utility of a role-theoretical perspective with the methodological utility of modern psychometric theory and multivariate research design, focuses on the prediction of situation-specific interpersonal behavior. The basic conceptual unit of analysis is the role, and situation-specific interpersonal behavior is conceptualized as the performance of a role. Individual differences in role performances are, according to this approach, related to variations in both trans-situationally stable personality characteristics and situationally variable social determinants. A conceptual model is presented which provides the framework for predicting situation-specific behavior. The conceptual model, as expressed in Equation 1, describes variation in role performance as a function of both person and situation variables.

A measurement and research model, both designed for operationalizing the conceptual model, are also presented and several techniques for applying the models are discussed. The measurement model (Equations 3 & 4) provides a rationale for measuring variation in attributes of both persons and situations. The research model (Equation 5) describes role performance as the outcome of a linear combination of person and situation variables, the combination to be determined empirically for each performance variable. Four research

studies (N=456), designed to test the empirical validity of the conceptual model and illustrate the application of the measurement and research models, are reported. Each study was concerned with the development and cross-validation of a set of measures for predicting situation-specific behavior. Three different types of role-related behavior were used in the studies. The first was a traditional performance variable, academic achievement. The second was self-reported behavior and the third was behavior observed in an experimentally controlled situation. Overall, the results of the research studies provide empirical support for the validity of the conceptual model. As predicted by the model, both person and situation variables were differentially and significantly related to the various indices of role performance. More importantly, the results of the cross validation of each study indicated that better prediction of situation-specific behavior can be obtained by combining both sources of information.

Situation or person?
Toward a psychosocial role-theoretical approach to personality

Among contemporary approaches to personality theory, there are basically two positions regarding the determinants of situational behavior. First, there are theories of personality that seek the determinants of situation-specific behavior in characteristics and attributes of the person. Both traditional trait and dynamic theories of personality argue that the individual's situational behavior is determined by trans-situationally stable constellations of characteristics and dispositions. Second, there are approaches to personality which argue that much of what appears to be person consistency across situations is actually situational consistency across persons (cf. Mischel, 1968; Peterson, 1968). From such a perspective, behavior in specific situations is viewed as a product of situation rather than person characteristics.

Do situation or do person characteristics determine human behavior? The question is, unfortunately, more easily asked than answered because the issue cannot be realistically reduced to one or the other. Most recent reviews (e. g., Bem & Allen, 1974; Bowers, 1973; Mischel, 1973) agree that an adequate approach to personality requires an account of both types of determinants. Further, there seems to be significant consensus concerning the method for resolving the issue. Most attempts to operationalize personality concepts have concentrated on the measurement of person characteristics.

The assessment of situational determinants of behavior has been given only cursory acknowledgement. However, the evidence presented by the advocates of both situationalism and nonsituationalism is convincing enough to suggest the need for new directions in personality theorizing. The recurrent nature of the controversy suggests the need for developing approaches to personality that provide the means for operationalizing both the person and situational determinants of behavior. The psychosocial role-theoretical model of personality described here is an attempt to develop such an approach.

This paper is organized into four major sections. The first presents an operational framework for an explicitly psychosocial approach to personality. The approach, which attempts to combine the conceptual utility of a role-theoretical perspective with the methodological utility of modern psychometric theory and multivariate research design, focuses on the prediction of situation-specific interpersonal behavior. The conceptual model is intended to provide a researchable paradigm for dealing with both person and situation determinants of situation-specific interpersonal behavior. The second and third sections outline a rationale for operationalizing the conceptual model. The rationale for operationalizing the model, which draws on both contemporary psychometric and multivariate methods, includes a measurement and a research model. The fourth section reports four research studies designed to test the empirical validity of the model by applying it to the prediction of several different types of situation-specific interpersonal behavior.

Background

Role theory is distinctly American in its origins. Its earliest formulations can be found in the work of Charles Cooley (1902) and George Herbert Mead (1934). Role-theoretical concepts have had an extensive impact on the anthropological, sociological, and psychological literature (cf. e. g., Banton, 1965; Brim, 1966; Brown, 1965; Erikson, 1950, 1974; Goffman, 1959; Hogan, 1973, 1975; Katz & Kahn, 1966; Kroeber, 1963; Linton, 1936; Merton, 1957; Parsons, 1951; Parsons & Shils, 1951; Sarbin & Allen, 1968). The approach outlined here draws on this role-theoretical tradition. A basic assumption of the approach reported in this paper is that the explanation of situational behavior requires a framework capable of dealing with both its social and psychological determinants. This approach assumes that the situation versus person controversy of contemporary personality theory is, at least at a conceptual level, a reflection of this more general dichotomy and that the direction for a workable resolution to this controversy lies in developing approaches to personality capable of operationalizing both views. Roles provide a natural conceptual unit for dealing with both the social and psychological determinants of behavior and psychosocial role theory draws on the role-theoretical tradition in an attempt to develop an explicitly psychosocial approach to personality. Since the role is the basic conceptual unit of analysis for the model, the first step in outlining the approach is to develop a conceptual definition of a role and to describe some characteristics of roles.

Roles

A role is normative in nature and consists of a constellation of socially defined rights, obligations, and rules of conduct. Roles provide the norms

and prescriptions for behavior in specific situations. Roles exist as part of the ongoing social process; they are an essential element of the social interaction system. Roles are mutually defined by the expectations of all of the participants of a particular social setting. While roles are an essential element of social interaction systems, they are not all identical in content or structure. The content and structure of roles varies within social groups, between social groups, and over time. Variation in role structure is a consequence of variation in social group organization, function, and objectives. Roles thus constitute a very basic unit of social analysis, and will serve as the basic unit of analysis for the conceptual model to be described next.

The conceptual model

Roles provide a natural conceptual link between the person and the social situation, and psychosocial role theory attempts to operationalize this link at the level of both the individual and the social situation. The conceptual model provides a framework for operationalizing situation-specific social demands and expectations and trans-situational person characteristics. The conceptual model also provides a framework for predicting situation-specific behavior. Psychosocial role theory thus focuses on the relationship between situation variables and person variables, and how this relationship influences situation-specific interpersonal behavior. The measurement and research models provide a rationale for applying the conceptual model in research settings. We will discuss each of these models separately, beginning with the conceptual model.

The conceptual model makes three assumptions about interpersonal behavior. The first assumption is that interpersonal behavior takes place within a structured, rule-governed context that places demands upon the individual. Interpersonal interactions do not occur in a vacuum. As Berger (1963) notes, "From the viewpoint of the individual participant...each situation he enters confronts him with specific expectations and demands of him specific responses." (p. 94) Roles consist of constellations of socially defined rights, obligations, and rules of conduct which provide norms and prescriptions for behavior in specific situations. Situation-specific interpersonal behavior, from a role-theoretical perspective, typically involves the performance of a role of some sort. A second assumption of the model is

that the individual's behavior in a specific interpersonal situation is, in part, a function of the situational demands that a particular role places on the individual and the individual's perception of those demands. The third assumption of the model is that the individual's situation-specific interpersonal behavior is, in part, a function of trans-situational characteristics that the individual brings into a role setting, i. e., the individual's personality structure.

The conceptual model consists of three components: a performance component, a person component, and a situation component. The first component, the performance component, is defined by appropriate role-related behavior. The situation component consists of the role expectations associated with a particular interpersonal situation and the individual's perception of them. The third component, the person component, consists of the individual's self-perceptions. The conceptual model can be more formally expressed by the familiar equation:

$$RP = f\ (P,S) \qquad (1)$$

where: RP = role performance

P = person variable

S = situation variable

The conceptual model thus consists of a dependent variable and two independent variables and describes situation-specific behavior (defined as a role performance) as a function of both person and situation variables.

The measurement model

Modern psychometric theory provides many useful and powerful tools for measuring psychological variables. While the systematic application of such measurement methods to psychological research has contributed much to our understanding of human behavior, it has also pointed out certain limitations in traditional approaches. These limitations become particularly important when traditional psychometric methods are applied to personality research. The explicitly social psychological nature of a role-theoretical approach to personality, I would like to argue, requires that we reexamine and modify some basic assumptions concerning traditional approaches to psychological measurement, particularly in relation to situational influences on psychometric definitions of "true" and "error" variance.

The social psychological nature of a psychosocial theory of roles requires a definition of both person and situation measures. The rationale developed here, as in the case of traditional test theory, is primarily for measures composed of some combination of responses to items. The first step is to define a person measure such that it has the characteristics a social psychological theory requires. In keeping with this requirement, an obtained score on a person measure will be defined as consisting of three components: a person component, a situation component, and a error component. This notion is ex-

pressed by the following equation:

$$X_{PER\ MEAS} = X_{PER} + X_{SIT} + X_e \qquad (2)$$

where: $X_{PER\ MEAS}$ = an obtained score on a person measure

X_{PER} = person component

X_{SIT} = situation component

X_e = error component

The most important idea expressed by this equation is that situation variance is NOT error variance. That is, situation variance is a distinct and identifiable component of obtained score variance on a person variable. According to this model, person and situation variance are both forms of "true" variance in the sense that, depending upon the attribute measured and the situation in which it is measured, both person and situation components are a source of systematic as opposed to random variation. Further, an obtained score on a person measure is described by the equation as the sum of all three components.

The next step is to logically define a situation measure. A score on a situation measure can be defined as consisting of two components: a situation component and an error component. This idea can be expressed as follows:

$$X_{SIT\ MEAS} = X_{SIT} + X_e \qquad (3)$$

where: $X_{SIT\ MEAS}$ = an obtained score on a situational measure

The most important idea expressed by this equation is that for a situation measure, situation variance is, by definition, true variance. Further, that a situation measure, like a score on a person measure, cannot be assumed error free. Consequently, the equation describes an obtained score on a situation measure as the sum of both components.

As it now stands, person and situation measures are defined as the simple additive of their respective components. However, the assumption of traditional test theory that variance in person attributes is constant across situations is not a necessary one. The opposite assumption, that person variance is not situation free, requires that the definition of an obtained score on a person measure be expanded such that for any set of obtained scores, the weight applied to each component will vary. That is, unlike traditional test theory, which assumes that an obtained score or a person measure is the summative combination of true and error component, this approach assumes that an obtained score is a linear combination of at least three components (a person, situation, and error component) which has to be situationally determined for each person measure. Equation 4 is thus expanded to read:

$$X_{PER\ MEAS} = b_1X_{PER} + b_2X_{SIT} + b_3X_e \qquad (4)$$

where: b = weight applied to each component

This definition (Equations 3 & 4) of a person and a situation measure provides the rationale for the measurement devices to be reported in a later section of the paper. There are two important practical consequences of Equations

3 & 4. First, rules and procedures for combining the components of person and situation measures cannot be determined independent of the situation in which they are applied. In the case of person measures, scores will always, according to this definition, reflect a certain amount of situation variance—that amount to be determined for each situation and each person variable measured. For example, scores on certain person variables (e. g., cognitive-ability variables) appear to be little influenced by situational factors, while scores on other person variables (e. g., personality, interest, and attitude variables) appear to be strongly influenced by situational variance. In the case of situation measures, rules and procedures for combining the components, by definition, have to be determined for each situation.

Second, an estimate of "true" variance in an obtained distribution of both person and situation measures (i. e., the measures' reliabilities) has to be obtained for each particular situation in which the devices are used.

The research model

In addition to a measurement model, the explicitly multivariate nature of the theory (and the measurement model) requires that we consider a generalized research model. Fortunately, recent trends in contemporary behavioral science research design (particularly multivariate approaches) reflect a general recognition of the complex nature of the determinants of human conduct. Attempts to develop quantitative methods for dealing with the complex interaction between psychological and nonpsychological variables and human behavior have resulted

in major advances in applied multivariate methodology (cf. Cooley & Lohnes, 1971; Kelly, Beggs, & McNeil, 1969; Tatsuoka, 1971). The explicitly social psychological nature of a role theory represents, in an important sense, a conceptual counterpart to this general methodological trend. A psychosocial approach to personality provides the conceptual equipment for combining both person and situation information in the prediction of situation-specific behavior. The methodological equipment for operationalizing the theory already exists in the form of modern regression techniques and needs no elaboration here. The primary purpose of this section is to propose a basic research model for combining the components of the conceptual model using contemporary regression procedures.

The conceptual model consists of a dependent variable (role performance) and two classes of independent variables (person and situation) variables. For research purposes role performance can be defined as any meaningful, quantifible index of social behavior. Various dimenions of role performance can be operationalized using standard techniques common to the psychological literature and several such methods will be discussed when the model is applied. No such techniques however, exist for operationalizing the independent variables. A workable theory of roles should be able to deal with the social and psychological determinants of behavior and their relationship to actual role performance. Some techniques for operationalizing role expectations and personality structure will be outlined in the following section. The research model can be formally described as:

$$\hat{P} = b_1 X_{PER\ MEAS} + b_2 X_{SIT\ MEAS} \qquad (5)$$

where: $\hat{P}$ = role performance

$X_{PER\ MEAS}$ = a person measure

$X_{SIT\ MEAS}$ = a situation measure

b = weight applied to each variable

The most important notion expressed by this equation is that an individual's performance of a role can be predicted by a knowledge of his standing on some combination of person and situation variables. The number of variables in the equation will, of course, vary depending upon such factors as the complexity of the role performed, the technique by which role performance is quantified, the number of quantifiable person and situation variables available to the researcher, etc. The weights applied to the variables can be selected rationally or by using an empirical procedure (e. g., a least squares solution). The dependent variable in the equation (role performance) is thus some quantifiable index of social behavior, and the predictor variables are some linear combination of quantifiable situation variables (e. g., the individual's perception of the situational demands associated with a particular role) and person variables (e. g., the individual's personality structure). In sum, the equation specifically describes a role performance as the outcome of some combination of person and situation variables, the combination to be determined by the nature of the performance variable.

Empirical Application

Study 1

The first study reports the development of a measure of role and self-perception for operationalizing the components of the model. The measure of role-perception was developed using the following procedure. First, a representative sample of roles was selected from the Social Opinions Inventory (Finley, 1955). Ten semantic differential rating forms, each containing 39 items, were constructed using the standard format reported by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1971). A sample of undergraduate volunteers (N = 104) were asked to describe the ten roles using the 39 pairs of adjectives. The sample contained 59 females and 45 males; the average was 25.1 (SD = 6.72). Two forms of the rating scales were used to control for order effects. The order of the roles was determined randomly for each form and the two forms were distributed randomly to the participants. Subsequent analyses were conducted across both forms to cancel out any order effect. The final items for the measure of role-perception were selected through the use of a factor analysis. The intercorrelation matrix of the 39 items for the entire sample of ratings (N = 1040) was subjected to a principal components analysis which yielded seven factors with an eigenvalue greater than unity. The seven factor matrix was then rotated using the varimax procedure. The rotated factor matrix accounted for 57.1 percent of the total variance. The first four factors (which were labeled evaluation, status, masculinity-femininity, and emotionality) yielded the most interpretable results and accounted for 77.7% of the total factor variance. The last three factors, whose interpretation was more ambiguous, together accounted for 33.3% of the total factor variance. The eight highest loading items from each of the first four factors were selected for use as a measure of role-perception.

The measure of self-perception reported here was developed using a procedure similar to that used for the measure of role-perception. A single semantic differential rating form containing the same 39 items was constructed using the standard semantic differential format. To insure the empirical independence of the measure of self-perception, the self-report forms were administered to a separate sample of

undergraduate volunteers (N = 124). The sample contained 60 females and 64 males; the average age was 23.7 (SD = 4.81). The volunteers were asked to describe themselves using the 39 adjective pairs. The intercorrelation matrix of the 39 items for this sample was subjected to a principal components analysis which yielded eight factors with an eigenvalue greater than unity. The eight factor matrix accounted for 66.7 percent of the total variance. The first three factors (which were labeled evaluation, masculinity-femininity, and emotionality) yielded the most interpretable results and accounted for a large (47.1%) percentage of the total factor variance. Since all of the items which loaded on the first four factors of the pervious measure also loaded on the first three factors of the measure of self-perception, the decision was made to use a single research questionnaire form containing the 32 most representative items for both the measure of role and self-perception.

The prediction of situation-specific behavior requires that the researcher effectively use all (both person and situation) available information. In the series of research studies summarized below, the measure of role and self-perception were used to operationalize the situation and person component of the model. For each study, a situation-specific set of keys were developed for the measures of role and self-perception. Two techniques for keying the measures to specific performance criteria will be reported. While not the only approach to deriving situation-specific keys, they do illustrate the practical utility of using situationally keyed measures for predicting situation specific behavior.

Study 2

This study deals with a type of role performance of general relevance to the academic community—academic performance. Academic performance (usually in the form of academic achievement) is a standard research variable and there exist many generally accepted methods for operationalizing it—e. g., grades, teacher ratings, achievement test scores, etc. (Anastasi, 1968; Guilford, 1954; Stanley & Hopkins, 1972). For this study, a sample of undergraduate volunteers (N = 72) from three different upper division psychology courses were administered the research questionnaire along with the Quick Word Test (Borgatta & Corsini, 1965), a measure of general intelligence. The sample contained 30 males and 43 females; the average age

was 22.6 (SD = 5.3). The research questionnaire was administered in both the role and self-perception format. In the role-descriptive format, participants were asked to describe their perception of the role of a university student using the 32 semantic differential items. In the self-report format, participants were asked to describe themselves using the same 32 items. Academic performance was operationalized as final course grade in each of the courses. For research purposes, an individual's final course grade consisted of the sum of the number of items correctly answered on three separate, computer scored multiple choice exams, each covering approximately one third of the course content. Since three separate courses were involved, final grades were transformed into standard scores and the standard scores used as the performance variable in the subsequent analyses. There were two phases for the analyses. The first phase involved developing a set of situation-specific keys using a factor analytic technique (Alpha solution and oblique rotation); the second phase involved the cross-validation of the keys. The total sample (N = 72) was first randomly divided into two subsamples--a derivation sample (N = 34) and a cross-validation sample (N = 38). The derivation sample was used to develop a set of keys for the measure of role and self-perception; the cross-validation sample was used to determine the predictive validity of the derived weights. The derived keys were validated separately for each measure and in combination using a regression analysis. The regression analysis yielded a cross-validated multiple R of .57, F (4,33) = 3.01, p. < .05.

Study 3

This study deals with a type of behavior generally considered of broad social relevance—drug use. The current psychological literature on drug use among college students is extensive, and one of the most commonly used indices of involvement with drugs is self-reported drug use (e.g., Grossman, Goldstein, & Eiserman, 1971; Hogan, Mankin, Conway, & Fox, 1970; McAree, Steffenhagen, & Zheutlin, 1969; Zinberg & Weil, 1970). For this study, the role in question was the role of drug user, and the performance variable was self-reported drug use. For this study, a sample of undergraduate students (N = 98) from several psychology and nonpsychology courses (including a course on drugs and society) volunteered to complete an anonymous questionnaire concerned with the various kinds of drug use and the measure of role and self-perception. In the role-descriptive format, students were asked to describe

their conception of the typical drug user, in the self-descriptive format they were asked to describe themselves. The incident of self-reported marijuana use [Never, Occasionally, Often (once a week or more), Frequently (more than 5 days a week)] was used as the performance variable for this study. For this study, the situationally keyed measures were derived using another common scale construction technique—item criterion keying. As in the previous study, the total sample (N = 92) was randomly split into two subsamples—a derivation sample (N = 42) and a cross-validation sample (N = 42). The derivation sample was employed in deriving a set of situational keys using criterion keying and the method of reciprocal averages (Guion, 1965). The predictive validity of the set of weights derived using this method was determined, as before, both separately for each set of keys and in combination using a regression analysis. The regression analysis yielded a cross-validate multiple R of .43, F (2,40) = 4.18, p. < .05.

Study 4

The final study deals with one of the most commonly encountered but until relatively recently one of the least researched roles in the psychological literature—the role of a subject in a psychological experiment. The role of a subject in a psychological experiment is a complex one and many studies have documented the complex set of demands that influence a research participant's behavior (Adair, 1973; Orne, 1962; Rosenthal, 1966). For this study, the role in question was that of a subject in a psychological experiment and the performance component of the model was operationalized as behavior in the now classic Asch-type conformity experiment. A sample of psychology and nonpsychology undergraduates (N = 58) participated, in groups of four or five, in an Asch-type conformity situation using a standard Cruchfield apparatus. The sample contained 31 males and 27 females; the average age was 23.3 (SD = 6.1). Stimuli for the conformity situation were drawn from the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960). Ten dogmatism and ten reversed dogmatism items were randomly selected from a pool of 29 items. These twenty items were used as test stimuli. The "majority" responses to the 20 stimuli were randomly programmed so that the majority agreed with five of the dogmatism items, disagreed with five of the dogmatism items, disagreed with five of the reversed dogmatism items, and agreed with five of the reversed dogmatism items. After the majority responses were keyed, the final order of stimuli presentation was then randomly determined. For purposes of analysis, each individual's conformity score consisted of the total number of times he agreed with the obstensible majority, without regard to item content. The performance variable for this study was thus the number of times the individual yielded in an

experimentally controlled conformity situation. After the appropriate number of persons had reported to the psychology laboratory at the appointed time, all participants were read a set of instructions explaining the nature of the task they were about to perform. As part of the instructions, participants were told that they would each individually report to a lab cubical and fill out the questionnaire that they would find on the table. Participants were asked to describe both themselves and their perceptions of the role of a subject in a psychological experiment while sitting in a lab cubical facing a bank of lights to be used with the Cruchfield apparatus. For this study, a set of situationally keyed measures were developed using the factor analytic technique described in Study 2. A derivation sample was used to generate as set of weights for the semantic differential items; the hold-out sample used to cross-validate the weights. The predictive validity of the situationally keyed measures was determined for each measure separately and in combination using a regression analysis. The cross validated multiple R for this study was .49, F (3,26) = 2.62, p. < .10.

Discussion

Psychosocial role theory, as it is here described, represents an attempt to combine a role-theoretical perspective with modern psychometric and research methods, and focuses on the prediction of situation-specific interpersonal behavior. Situation-specific interpersonal behavior is conceptualized as the outcome of both social and psychological determinants. The conceptual model, as expressed in Equation 1, describes interpersonal behavior (defined as role performance) as a function of both person and situation variables.

One of the conceptual advantages of a psychosocial theory of roles is that it seeks to operationalize both person and situational determinants of interpersonal behavior. Most traditional attempts to operationalize personality concepts have focused on the measurement of attributes of the person and modern psychometric theory provides many useful and powerful tools for measuring psychological variables. Little systematic consideration, however, has been given to situational influences on certain types of psychological variables, particularly those attributes of the person most subject to situational influences (e. g., personality, interest, and attitude variables). Classical test theory defines situational influences on such measures as error variance. The measurement model (Equations 2 & 3) presented here, on the other hand, describes situation variance as a legitimate source of test variance and provides a definition of both a person and a situation measure that requires an account of situational influences on such measures.

In addition to a research model, the paper also presents a research model for use with a psychosocial theory of roles. The research model (Equation 5) describes a role performance as the outcome of a linear combination of person and situation variables, the combination to be determined empirically for each performance variables.

The measurement model presented here places no restriction on the type of device used to measure variation in person and situation attributes. The article discusses one type of measurement device, the semantic differential scale, and describes the development of two parallel research measures for use with the conceptual model. The research measures consists of a set of semantic differential items selected to be of general relevance for self and role-description. The measure of role expectation provides a means for operationalizing some basic dimensions of differential role expectation and the measure of self-perception provides a means for operationalizing some basic dimensions of personality structure.

Several research studies, designed to test the empirical validity of the conceptual model and illustrate the application of the measurement and research models in research settings, were reported. Each study was concerned with the development and cross-validation of a set of measures for predicting situation-specific behavior. Three different types of role related behavior were used in the studies. The first was a traditional performance variable, academic achievement as defined by course grade. The second was a self-reported behavior, frequency of marijuana use. The third was behavior observed in an experimentally controlled situation. Overall, the results of the research studies provide empirical support for the validity and utility of the conceptual model. As predicted by the model, both person and situation variables were differentially and significantly related to the various indices of role performance. More importantly, the results of the regression analyses indicate that better prediction of situation-specific role-related behavior can be obtained by combining both sources of information.

The measurement and research models are intended to provide a rationale for applying sound psychometric and reserach methods to the prediction of specific types of behavior and thus subject to the limitations of contemporary psychometric and research methods. The initial research efforts, however, are promising and the results of the studies suggest that the conceptual model provides a workable paradigm for dealing with situation-specific behavior.

References

Adair, J. G. The human subject: The social psychology of the psychological experiment. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. London: Macmillan, 1968.

Banton, M. Roles: An introduction to the study of social relations. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Bem, D. J., & Allen, A. On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, 506-520.

Berger, P. L. Invitation to sociology: A humanistic perspective. New York: Doubleday, 1963.

Borgatta, E. F., & Corsini, R. J. Quick Word Test. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1965.

Bowers, K. S. Situationalism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 307-336.

Brim, O. G., Jr. Socialization through the life cycle. In O. G. Brim, Jr., and Wheeler, Socialization after childhood. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Brown, R. Social Psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Cooley, C. H. Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner, 1902.

Cooley, W. W., & Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate data analysis. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Erikson, E. H. Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers by E. H. Erikson. New York: International Universities Press, 1974.

Finley, C. B. The social opinions inventory as a measure of social maturity. Child Development, 1955, 26, 81-90.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Grossman, J. C., Goldstein, R., & Eisenman, R. Openness to experience and marijuana use: An initial investigation. Preceedings of the 79th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971, 6, 335-336. (Summary)

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Guion, R. Personnel testing. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Hogan, R. Moral conduct and moral character. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 217-232.

Hogan, R. Theoretical egocentricism and the problem of compliance. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 533-540.

Hogan, R., Mankin, D., Conway, J., & Fox, S. Personality correlates of undergraduate marijuana use. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 58-63.

Katz, P. and Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Kelly, F. J., Beggs, D. L. & McNeil, K. A. Research design in the behavioral sciences: Multiple regression approach. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.

Kroeber, A. L. Anthropology: Culture patterns and processes. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1963.

Linton, R. The study of man: An introduction. New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 252-283.

McAree, C. P., Steffenhagen, R. A., & Zheutlin, L. S. Personality factors in college drug users. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1969, 15, 102-106.

Orne, M. T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 776-783.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Peterson, D. R. The clinical study of social behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rosenthal, R. Experimenter effects in behavioral research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. Vol. 1. (2nd ed.) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Stanley, J. C., & Hopkins, K. D. Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Tatsuoka, M. M. Multivariate analysis: Techniques for education and psychological research. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Zinberg, N. E., & Weil, A. T. A comparison of marijuana users and non-users. Nature, 1970, 226, 119-123.